



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 2044 103 244 869

**Naturalization and Immigration
Committee**

Hearing on H. R. 558

106
245

US.
260
64H.5IN
I33 r6
9/6



**HARVARD LAW SCHOOL
LIBRARY**

106
245

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

0
47

HEARINGS

BEFORE

U. S. Congress, Senate
THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION
AND NATURALIZATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 558

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1916

AND

FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1916

STATEMENT OF

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1916

U. S.
240
64 H. 5 IN
I 33 r b
914

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

JOHN L. BURNETT, Alabama, *Chairman*.

ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois.

JOHN A. M. ADAIR, Indiana.

JAMES L. SLAYDEN, Texas.

JOHN E. RAKER, California.

JOHN A. KEY, Ohio.

JOSEPH V. FLYNN, New York.

RILEY J. WILSON, Louisiana.

GEORGE E. HOOD, North Carolina.

EVERIS A. HAYES, California.

ALBERT JOHNSON, Washington.

CALEB POWERS, Kentucky.

JACOB E. MEEKER, Missouri.

ISAAC SIEGEL, New York.

THOMAS D. SCHALL, Minnesota.

P. W. BURNETT, *Clerk*.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SABATH. Gentlemen, the chairman desires to take the floor now, and I hope that each and every one will pay strict attention to what he has to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, I shall want to proceed for an hour without interruption, and then I will allow reasonable time for questions. We only have one more speaker on our side; that is, only one more who was requested to speak, and I will be very glad if I may be permitted, as we have proceeded heretofore, to proceed for an hour without interruption. I will be very glad if I can have order both among the audience and the committee. Judge Sabath will occupy the chair in the meantime.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN L. BURNETT.

Mr. BURNETT. Gentlemen, the reason why I think I should be heard at this time, and heard for the record, is because of a number of misleading statements, and many of them incorrect statements, made by speakers yesterday. It was, no doubt, observed by the committee that gentlemen who came representing New York almost invariably took the position that they were representing the whole country. A gentleman, Mr. Schlopocoff, a member of the New York Assembly, who claimed to represent a hundred thousand garment makers, I believe, admitted that this organization had never officially gone on record against the measure, and yet assumed that he knew more about it than the organization and all the representatives of the various great labor organizations all over this country, and I want to call attention, gentlemen, to some recent occurrences.

The gentleman, Mr. Louis Hammerling, was especially unkind, I think, in the statement he made, that the secretary of the Federation of Labor had furnished me a question to ask in regard to Youngstown. That was absolutely untrue. I had no conference with Mr. Morrison in regard to the matter.

This same gentleman once before made it his business to make an attack before this committee upon representatives of the American Federation of Labor. In a previous hearing he made this statement—

As an ex-member of the union—

Gentlemen, I emphasize the fact that he is an "ex-member"; for what reason, I do not know—

I know something about their doings, and hope it will be taken down as I state it. The labor leaders have realized to-day that the foreign-speaking population can not be managed by them in their own way, as was done 20 years ago. We have advanced,

become acquainted with American institutions, and have educated ourselves. When they could use us, they were satisfied to have us come, but they have found we object to some of their methods.

That was at a previous meeting, and yesterday he went out of his way to make a similar slur and attack. I hope this gentleman, who said he represented a large list of foreign-language newspapers, did not represent those newspapers when he made that attack upon the representatives of labor organizations. I hope that he did not represent those newspapers when he also made the attack that he made upon the lady who said she was the editor or the manager of *The Immigrant*—I believe is the name of the magazine—from which I took the statement that more than 2,500,000 foreign-born whites over 21 years of age were unable to speak the English language, and that of that number only about 36,000 were attending the schools for the purpose of learning to read and speak it. I have here the statement of the Bureau of Industries and Immigration of the State of New York, New York State Department of Labor for 1913, in which they refer to facts of a similar kind.

On page 68 it is said:

In a survey of educational work bearing on the assimilation of adult aliens the North American Civic League, with the cooperation of the bureau, found that night schools where English was taught to foreigners were maintained last year in 31 cities and towns. The attendance at such English-to-foreigners' classes for New York City was 14,334; for the rest of the State 6,600, making a total of 25,000 for the entire State. Approximately 300,000 adult immigrants entered the State during the same period of time, so that only one in every twelve was entered in those English night classes.

Mr. Hamerling, also, as I caught his remarks, made some criticism of the secretary of the American Federation of Labor, in attributing to him, as I understood, the strike that has just occurred at Youngstown, Ohio. One thing that inspired the question that I asked Mr. Hamerling, was some reports that you no doubt received yesterday, and which I had just received, from which I desire to read some extracts in regard to that strike.

This is a report from the Committee on Industrial Relations, Southern Building, Washington, D. C., and is dated January 18:

Babies of the workers die at an appalling rate. Forty-one per cent of all deaths in Youngstown during 1913, according to United States census figures, were of children under 5 years of age.

The average head of a family among foreign-born steelworkers, who constitute over 70 per cent of the entire force, earns less than \$500 a year.

The workers and their families live in squalid, overcrowded houses. A trachoma epidemic at East Youngstown grew so menacing that the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., whose armed guards on January 7 killed 3 strikers and wounded 25, had to take drastic measures to save the human part of its equipment.

Sanitary conditions in Youngstown in the districts where the steelworkers live are frightful. The administration of the health laws is lax, and open garbage boxes and dry privies abound.

The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. has paid for eight years 8 per cent dividends on its \$10,000,000 of capital stock. In 1913 it cut a melon in the form of a 50 per cent stock dividend. In other words, the stock has paid 12 per cent during the past two years and a half. Its value is \$285 a share.

For years, until the present demand for unskilled labor gave them a choice of jobs, the steelworkers have been forced to accept whatever the Steel Corporation and its followers cared to give them, or to starve. This condition of helplessness and economic slavery was forced on them by a policy that kept, with the aid of charity, two men for every job and that ruthlessly crushed any attempt of the employees to organize.

The Youngstown strike was a sign to the owners and managers of the American steel industry that the end will come: that they can not forever adhere to their present

policy of depressing wages below a decedent standard by maintaining a vast horde of helpless immigrants in a condition of economic subservency, throwing them on charity during times of depression, paying less than a living wage during times of prosperity, and during all times brutalizing them either by imposing excessive hours of employment or by imposing the enforced leisure that breeds fear and pauperization.

The statement has been made, and, I think, is verified by this very occurrence, that these employers brought to Youngstown illiterates from southern Europe in large numbers for the purpose of beating down the price of wages, and it resulted in driving out nearly all the American workingmen and the northwestern Europeans from those jobs. I had a conversation a few years ago with one of the great mine operators in the Birmingham district, in which I asked, "Who are your best laborers?" and he mentioned the Welsh as the best miners, and then came along with other nationalities from northwestern Europe, and the Americans. I said, "Who are your poorest laborers?" He said, "The southern Italians." I said, "Why is it that you employ them? Are they poorer laborers than the negro?" He said, "They stay on the job better than the negro, but otherwise they are poorer than the negro." I said, "Why then do you employ them?" And he said, "For the purpose of regulating wages."

Now, you gentlemen who have spoken here sit in New York City and write books on the theory of immigration, and set yourselves up before this committee as knowing more about it than the actual toiler in the mines and on the railroads and in the factories all over this country.

Discussing the riot of January 7, in which 3 strikers were killed and 25 others wounded by armed company guards employed by the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., this Youngstown report further says:

The riot was the natural outgrowth of a spontaneous, unorganized rebellion against an economic and industrial régime so oppressive and brutalizing as to overshadow the immediate provocation and render it comparatively insignificant.

Not only is there likelihood of a repetition of the Youngstown riot at any one of the large steel plants that altogether employ nearly 300,000 men, but an investigation discloses that even such a disaster, shocking as it is, must be regarded as trifling when compared with the heavy toll of death and suffering that has been exacted day after day and year after year by what have come to be regarded as normal conditions in the steel industry.

The prevailing demand for unskilled labor in many large industries has given the unorganized workers in the steel industry the first opportunity accorded to them in many years to register their protest against these conditions without danger of starving.

They were about to make the most of this opportunity not only in Youngstown but throughout the industry, when the management of the United States Steel Corporation awoke to the danger. Whether the 10 per cent advance in wages, effective February 1, will be sufficient to check the revolt remains to be seen.

This shows, gentlemen, why it is that the American laborer has to live under these horrible conditions, as well as under this standard of wages. The illiterate foreigner is the cudgel with which they crush the decent toiler.

A few years ago I was making a speech in my district and referred to the fact that the better class of laborers was being driven out all through Pennsylvania and other mining districts in this country by the low-priced laborer from southern Europe.

After I had finished my speech, a gentleman came to me and said, "I am from Youngstown. I stayed there, working in one of those

plants for a long time, but they continued to bring in that low class of laborers who worked at starvation wages, and set up low standards of living, and, naturally, I did not want my family to be contaminated by such surroundings, and that is why I left, and influenced others to leave."

Gentlemen, that accounts for the fact that 70 per cent and more of the employees in those Youngstown industries were foreigners.

This report goes on:

Evidence is conclusive that the wage policy of the Steel Corporation has been based on the existence of a huge surplus of unskilled labor constantly replenished from Europe. So long as the corporation could maintain, with the aid of charity, two men for every job, discontent was smothered. It flared up the instant the steel workers became aware that they could quit their jobs without starving.

A Government investigation published in 1910 showed that 70.8 per cent of the steel workers at Youngstown were of foreign birth. In 330 typical families investigated by the Government, the heads of families earned an average of \$440 a year. Forty per cent of these heads of families earned less than \$400 per year, and 14 per cent earned less than \$200 per year. In the year covered by the investigation only 48 per cent worked nine months or over. Sixty-five per cent of the families kept boarders, and an average of 3.34 persons occupied each sleeping room.

At the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.'s plant, which for more than eight years has earned dividends of 8 per cent on its capital stock, and since July, 1913, has paid dividends of 12 per cent, on a basis of \$10,000,000 of common stock, the privilege of working three days a week during these years of slack operation was doled out as charity might be after investigation had shown that the man's family was in need. To supplement the boon thus granted, baskets of food were distributed to the most needy, and the cost of the food was later deducted from the husband's or father's wages. The company also donated \$1,000 a year to the Charity Organization Society. The Republic Iron & Steel Co. gave \$500 as its annual contribution. The management of the Carnegie Steel Co., a member of the United States Steel Corporation, refused to give anything. The authority for the foregoing statements is General Secretary Hanson of the Charity Organization Society.

Not only are the homes of the workers overcrowded but they are surrounded by piles of exposed garbage and open privies stand near the doors. Indescribably filthy are the yards, streets, and alleys adjoining them, in which the children of the workers play. General Secretary Hanson of the Charity Organization Society told the writer that the administration of the health laws has been notoriously lax for at least eight years, being in the hands, he said, of a health officer whom he regarded as incompetent and who appointed ignorant and untrained men as inspectors. My investigation showed that a law prohibiting the exposure of garbage was wantonly and generally disregarded within a few blocks of the business center of Youngstown.

Gentlemen, would any decent, self-respecting American laborer, or any decent, self-respecting German or Scandinavian or Englishman or Irishman tolerate any such conditions? And that why it is that these people have been driven from pillar to post. They are keeping two men for every job, and at a low rate of wages upon which no man in our country would want to try to maintain his family.

The report goes on continuously with that kind of statements.

The maintenance of an industrial force that during half the time is twice as large as the force that can be utilized must be attributed to something worse than disorganized and anarchic conditions in the steel industry. It must be attributed to the deliberate policy of the Steel Corporation and those that follow its lead of maintaining two men for every job in order that the workers shall have no choice between accepting the wages offered and starving.

For while the steel workers are recruited from immigrants with large families, which chain them to the community in which they settle, and to which home-building schemes with the installment feature rivet them still more securely, construction workers are migratory and able to take advantage of every increase in the demand for labor. The steel company feared the contagion of higher wages. But they could not conceal from their employees the fact that unskilled labor was in demand.

Neither the strike at the Republic plant or at that of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube plant was instigated or in any way directly brought about by the American Federation of Labor, although the campaign begun three years ago by the American Federation of Labor with the object of reaching the unskilled and helpless steel workers with the message of organization undoubtedly had considerable influence.

After the strike began at the Republic plant, organizers for the Federation were sent to Youngstown and formed local unions, including a federal union of unskilled workers with 1,000 members. Officials of the Republic company met with committees elected by these unions, and when the strike was settled, they promised not to discriminate against union men. Thus, there now exists in the Republic plant the nucleus of a strong organization.

In striking contrast with the death and destruction that accompanied the strike at the Sheet & Tube Co.'s plant, was the orderly and peaceful progress of the strike of the employees of the Republic plant. At the former plant, organizers for the American Federation of Labor were prevented from hiring a hall and addressing the strikers on the day of the riot, in order to counsel moderation and orderly conduct.

Prosecuting Attorney Henderson of Youngstown declared publicly after his investigation that organized labor had nothing to do with the strike and riot at this plant, although its representatives did try in vain to reach the strikers with restraining influence.

Now, gentlemen, I would like to know how that comports with the statements of some of the gentlemen that we had before us yesterday!

Reference was made by Mr. Marshall to a change of front of Prof. Jenks on this question. Gentlemen, I want to read to you what Dr. Jenks said, and when he put up Dr. Eliot. I wish to call your attention to the following list of educators who favor this legislation:

A. Lawrence Lowell, president Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 John N. Tillman, president University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
 J. C. Branner, vice president Stanford University, California.
 K. G. Matheson, president Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.
 Charles A. Blanchard, president Wheaton University, Wheaton, Ill.
 George E. MacLean, president Iowa State University, Iowa City, Iowa.
 M. F. Troxell, president Midland College, Atchison, Kans.
 L. H. Blanton, vice president Central University, Danville, Ky.
 Thomas D. Boyd, president Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.
 E. B. Craighead, president Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
 George C. Chase, president Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
 George E. Fellows, president University of Maine, Orono, Me.
 Richard C. MacLaurin, president Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
 W. De Witt Hyde, president Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
 Henry A. Garfield, president Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
 James W. Cain, president Washington College, Chestertown, Md.
 James Wallace, ex-president University of Wooster, St. Paul, Minn.
 William H. Black, president Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Mo.
 C. H. Levermore, president Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 William P. Mason, president Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y.
 F. W. Atkinson, president Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 K. P. Battle, ex-president University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
 A. B. Church, president Buchtel College, Akron, Ohio.
 Alston Ellis, president Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Charles F. Thwing, president Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
 E. D. Warfield, president Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
 James T. Young, director Wharton School of Finance, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Clinton Lockhard, president Texas Christian University, North Waco, Tex.
 R. E. Blackwell, president Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
 David Starr Jordan, chancellor Stanford University, California.

HEADS OF OTHER EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS.

H. B. Battle, president Battle Laboratory, Montgomery, Ala.
 R. H. Webster, superintendent of schools, San Francisco, Cal.
 F. S. Curtis, principal Curtis School, Brookfield Center, Conn.
 Job Williams, principal American School for the Deaf, Hartford, Conn.
 Ralph K. Berace, principal Connecticut Literary Institute, Suffield, Conn.
 A. P. Bourland, secretary Southern Education Board, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Eugene S. Talbot, secretary American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill.
 C. H. Benjamin, dean school of engineering, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
 Albert P. Walker, head master Girls' High School, Boston, Mass.
 A. E. Winship, editor Journal of Education, Boston, Mass.
 L. L. Doggett, president International Young Men's Christian Association Training Schools, Springfield, Mass.
 William C. Collar, head master Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass.
 G. W. Bissell, dean department of engineering, Michigan Agricultural College, Lansing, Mich.
 Leon C. Marshall, dean University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 O. C. Gregg, superintendent Farmers' Institute, Lynde, Minn.
 William Treleare, director Missouri Botanic Garden, St. Louis, Mo.
 Lorin Webster, head Holderness School, Plymouth, N. H.
 Edward B. Vorhees, director Agricultural Experiment Station, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Walter R. Marsh, headmaster St. Paul's School, Garden City, N. Y.
 Milton H. Turk, dean William Smith College, Geneva, N. Y.
 M. N. Baker, editor Engineering News, New York City.
 Dr. Carlos MacDonald, former head New York State Lunacy Commission, New York City.
 George C. Ashmun, president board of education, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Edwin A. Barbour, director Penn Museum, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Daniel Carhart, dean Western University of Pennsylvania, Wilkesburg, Pa.
 Joseph L. Hills, director Agricultural Experiment Station, Burlington, Vt.
 A. H. Yoder, superintendent high school, Tacoma Wash.
 George C. Comstock, director Washburn Observatory, Madison, Wis.
 Charles McKenny, president State Normal School, Milwaukee, Wis.
 John A. H. Keith, president State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wis.
 Dr. A. C. Cowpenthwaite, president Chicago Homeopathic Medical College, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Marshall also said that the President would know more about this proposition and the public demand for it than we, who are fresh from the hands of our constituents, and who have to return and be held responsible by them every two years. Without harsh criticism of the President, I want to call your attention to the President's veto message which shows that he was not familiar with important facts which he made, in part at least, the basis of his veto, when he said that no political party had ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation.

Gentlemen, the President stated that, and yet, in 1896, the Republican party declared specifically in its platform for the illiteracy test, and the Democrats at the same time declared in favor of keeping out pauper labor from Europe.

Now, in regard to Prof. Jenks: Mr. Louis Marshall said that reference to his book would show that he had made declarations modifying the views that he expressed when he signed the report of the Congressional Immigration Commission stating that the illiteracy test was "the most feasible and practical method of restricting undesirable immigration." Every member of that commission agreed there was "an oversupply of unskilled labor in the country as a whole." Mr. Bennet, who alone dissented from the illiteracy test, himself joined in that statement, as did every single member of that commission—nine in number.

Mr. Marshall yesterday made a remark that I did not catch at the time, but some one told me of it afterwards. I made the statement that we only failed to carry it over President Wilson's veto by 8 votes; that a change of five votes would have put it over the veto. We lost 12 or 13 who had previously voted for it, and nearly all of those men

had been defeated, and some of them, I know, were applicants for bounties at the hands of the administration. I do not believe the great President of this Republic could be influenced by any such thing, and I doubt if he knew the vote even of these gentlemen, and yet there were members of Congress who no doubt believed that he would be influenced, and their votes were recorded against the votes that they had cast continuously before whenever it had been up for a vote. The remark of the gentleman that I did not catch and of which I was reminded afterwards, was that perhaps their favoring the test was the reason for their defeat, and yet, every man who has succeeded them, I am informed, is for this bill, and hence, the opponents of the bill were not gaining anything by defeating them, and getting other men who favor the bill.

Now, in regard to Prof. Jenks, he was a member of the commission, at one time one of the professors in Cornell University, and he said, in a letter to President Taft, when the matter was pending before him, and we were asking his signature to the same:

FEBRUARY 8, 1913.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have noted in the papers that you have before you for consideration the new immigration bill, and that February 6 you gave a hearing on the bill. As a former member of the Immigration Commission, who gave a great deal of time to the consideration of the subject, I trust that I may express an opinion regarding the bill. The fundamental reason why there should be at the present time a rather widely extended restriction of immigration is the fact that *the number of unskilled workers coming in at the present time is sufficient to check decidedly the normal tendency toward an improved standard of living in many lines of industry.*

Of course I am well aware of the fact that Mr. Hourwich in his new book, as often before, and many others claim that the bringing in of these laborers simply fills the demand for unskilled workmen and that the American laborers and the earlier immigrants go to higher positions. That was doubtless true earlier; that is doubtless true in part now, but the figures collected by the Immigration Commission, on a sufficient number of industries in different sections of the country to give general conclusions, *prove beyond doubt that in a good many cases these incoming immigrants actually drive out into other localities and into other unskilled trades large numbers of American workmen and workmen of the earlier immigration who do not get better positions, but, rather, worse ones.* My own judgment and that of a number of our investigators when the work of the Immigration Commission began was substantially that upheld now by Mr. Hourwich and those who agree with him. But Prof. Lauck, our chief superintendent of investigators in the field, and, so far as I am aware, *every single investigator in the field, before the work ended reached the conclusion from personal observation that the tendency of the large percentage of immigration of unskilled workers is clearly to lower the standard of living in a number of industries, and the statistics of the commission support this impression.* I therefore changed my earlier views.

I think the illiteracy test is theoretically sound. It is, of course, true that it does not reach the criminal. It is not intended for that purpose. It is also true that at times it excludes the good laborers. The fundamental fact, however, is this—that on the whole it excluded the laborers from southern Italy and Austria-Hungary of the type that *the commission unanimously thought ought to be excluded at the present time, especially the single man who comes here to stay only temporarily and who, in consequence, having no permanent interest in the country, eagerly accepts living conditions lower than those which would be accepted by Americans or the earlier immigrants.* It should be kept in mind that the *Immigration Commission was absolutely unanimous in the opinion that there should be restriction;* also unanimous in the further opinion that this class of immigrants whom I have mentioned were the ones who should be excluded, *and the illiteracy test would exclude just this class.*

Mr. Bennet objected to the illiteracy test and wished to reach the same result by other means, and I should have agreed with him, as I think would Dr. Neill and perhaps other members of the commission, had we believed that it was practicable to reach that result in any other way. Considering the temper of Congress and the other measures proposed, *the illiteracy test seemed the only practical way.* The present action of Congress seems to confirm that view.

I notice in yesterday's morning paper that Mr. Bennet suggested that, inasmuch as this bill is faulty in certain minor particulars, it would be wise for you to veto it and let the incoming Congress pass another bill to the same effect if it wishes to do so. It strikes me that the argument should rather be that if this bill is in its main principle of exclusion sound, and on that point Mr. Bennet agreed with all the other members of the commission, Republicans and Democrats, it would be wise for you to sign the bill and let the incoming Congress make such minor changes in the laws as it might see fit to make.

I trust that *since this bill is in the main in accord with the unanimous opinion of the Immigration Commission, the one body of men that has really made a thoroughly sound, scientific study of the question*, you will see your way clear to giving it your approval, even though it may have minor defects.

Very respectfully and sincerely, yours,

JEREMIAH W. JENKS.

The President,
Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C.

Now, gentlemen, that shows exactly how Prof. Jenks stands in regard to it, and in regard to his book itself the gentleman was mistaken.

Here is an extract which Senator Borah, favoring this bill, read in the Senate April 12, 1912, from that book to which the gentleman has referred, for the purpose of trying to bolster up a contrary contention. In the book he says:

Relative to the effect of recent immigration upon native American and older immigrant wage earners in the United States, it may be stated, in the first place, that the lack of industrial training and experience of the recent immigrant before coming to the United States, together with his illiteracy and inability to speak English, has had the effect of exposing the original employees to unsafe and insanitary working conditions, or has led to the imposition of conditions of employment which the native American or older immigrant employees have considered unsatisfactory and in some cases unbearable. When the older employees have found dangerous and unhealthy conditions prevailing in the mines and manufacturing establishments and have protested, the recent immigrant employees, usually through ignorance of mining or other working methods, have manifested a willingness to accept the alleged unsatisfactory conditions. In a large number of cases the lack of training and experience of the southern and eastern European affects only his own safety. On the other hand, his ignorant acquiescence in dangerous and insanitary working conditions may make the continuance of such conditions possible and become a menace to a part or to the whole of an operating force of an industrial establishment. In mining, the presence of an untrained employee may constitute an element of danger to the entire body of workmen. There seems to be a direct casual relation between the extensive employment of recent immigrants in American mines and the extraordinary increase within recent years in the number of mining accidents. It is an undisputed fact that the greatest number of accidents in bituminous-coal mines arise from two causes: (1) The recklessness and (2) the ignorance and inexperience of employees. When the lack of training of the recent immigrant abroad is considered in connection with the fact that he becomes a workman in the mines immediately upon his arrival in this country, and when it is recalled that a large proportion of the new arrivals are not only illiterate and unable to read any precautionary notices posted in the mines but also unable to speak English, and consequently without ability to comprehend instructions intelligently, the inference is plain that the employment of recent immigrants has caused a deterioration in working conditions.

And then, reading from page 190, Senator Borah further says:

The extensive employment of recent immigrants has brought about living conditions and a standard of living with which the older employees have been unable or have found it extremely difficult to compete. This fact may be readily inferred from what has already been said relative to the methods of domestic economy of immigrant households and the cost of living of their members.

And, not only that, but within the last few days, Prof. Jenks read, or had read, a lengthy argument on this question before the Civil Federation, of which the following is in part a brief summary:

The present is an opportune time to review and to summarize the question of immigration. The Americanization of the immigrant has taken on added significance in the last year or two, and thoroughgoing assimilation is now seen to be a much more difficult process than the vast majority of Americans have heretofore realized. So serious, in fact, has the issue of Americanization become that President Wilson deemed it necessary and fit to make it one of the chief points of interest in his recent presentation of the Nation's needs to Congress. Preparedness includes not only military and naval measures of defense but also measures that will insure a people loyal and steadfast in devotion to American ideals and principles.

From the economic standpoint a new angle to this question has been presented. For years the pros and cons of the industrial needs of this Nation in relation to immigration have been thrashed out. On the one side it has been argued that this country could not get along without a large annual addition of cheap labor to its working force; on the other side it has been claimed, and increasingly so, that restriction was needed in immigration, as the vast influx of newcomers was piling up tremendously social, political, and economic problems which were overwhelming the assimilative forces of the Nation. An opportunity is now given. The great conflict is providing an experiment in immigration restriction which should be of immense value in judging of the relative strength of the arguments used by these opposing groups.

In addition to these new points of added interest, the subject of immigration is covered by a quantity of authoritative material, both Government and private, for review and survey.

In brief, a breathing spell in immigration has been given this Nation, and advantage should be taken of the opportunity to summarize and to review on broad lines our immigration problems and policies and to formulate a national immigration policy which will conserve the best in the social, political, and economic fabric of this country.

With this view in mind, the following report is presented. It has been thought best to confine the report to the broad general aspects of the problem rather than make a detailed report covering all points. Legislation proposed in this report is presented in general terms, outlining policies rather than preventing complex details. The report is presented under four heads:

1. Social and economic factors in immigration.
2. The effect of the diminution in immigration caused by the war on industrial and labor conditions.
3. Restriction: Its necessity and a plan.
4. The urgent need for a coordinated domestic policy.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS IN IMMIGRATION.

Without going into too much detail regarding the number of immigrants, it is noteworthy that during the last 20 years, especially the last decade, there has been a very decided increase in the number of immigrants entering the country. From 1910 to 1914, inclusive, the total number of immigrant aliens entering was 5,175,000—almost enough to populate Greater New York. On the other hand, it should be noted also that speaking generally some 40 per cent of the immigrants entering this country return, and usually one-third finally return to make their permanent home in Europe. Significant also is the fact that during times of depression the number entering falls off materially while the number departing increases. It is probably true that during bad times following a crisis there is less unemployment than there would be if it were not so easy for people to return to Europe, and if news did not so readily reach Europe that it was unwise to come; but, on the other hand, this readiness of response owing to the cheapness of ocean transportation and the readiness with which news travels is an evil effect in that it encourages the ready immigration in the so-called "birds of passage," who come to work temporarily at whatever wages they can secure, who have no fixed stay in the country, and who consequently are ready to seize their own immediate advantage, even at the expense of those who are coming to make this country their permanent home. Moreover, these same conditions are likely to have an evil effect in that as times improve, from the ease in which the number of laborers increase, comes also an influence which tends to prevent an increase in wages and an improved condition of the laboring class that might otherwise be expected during periods of prosperity and such as that going on at the present time, which might well be jeopardized if a million or more additional workmen were being rapidly added to the labor supply.

The changed character in the source of immigration from a northern and western European immigration to a southern and eastern European immigration needs no extended discussion. Extremely significant is the predilection for races to flock together in groups and to crowd together into certain industries. Pennsylvania, for

example, took 44 per cent of the total Slovak immigration to this country in 1914, 13 per cent of the Ruthenian, 23 per cent of the Lithuanian, and nearly 20 per cent of the Italian. We have little sympathy with the race prejudice which often leads people without a careful reasoning to oppose bitterly the incoming races differing materially in customs from themselves. Difference does not necessarily predicate superiority or inferiority. At the same time, whenever the study becomes political in its nature, we must recognize the race factor as an element that must be dealt with and as a fact that can not be easily ignored, but that may still become a factor of determining importance in matters of policy. Moreover, if these race characteristics are so strong that it becomes impossible for the two races to assimilate, that they are practically melted one into the other through intermarriage and the complete adoption of one another's customs, it becomes at once an important problem, such as the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand now face in Asiatic immigration, whether it is wise to attempt to hold within the same political jurisdiction two races bound to remain separate in characteristics and ambitions, this entirely aside from any question of inferiority or superiority. Again, a too rapid racial change in immigration may in itself be bad. It means a clash in customs, of race, of ideals, and necessitates readjustments which may extend over a long period of time. There is much evidence to support the claim that extremely rapid change in racial composition and increase in numbers from the countries of southern and eastern Europe are making the problem of assimilation extremely difficult and causing racial changes the future of which no man can foresee.

Closely allied with the question of numbers of immigrants and their racial make-up is that of occupation and distribution. While the people who at home have been peasants on their own farms, they come to America to enter at once the mines or our great factories as unskilled laborers, taking the pay of men without training. In 1914, for example, only 23,891 immigrants were destined to the great agricultural States of Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Oklahoma, while 344,663, over one-fourth of the number, were destined to the State of New York, and 65 per cent of the total, or 790,000 people, to five States. Neither are they later distributed, for over 223,731 more foreign born in actual numbers were to be found in the country districts in 1910, as compared with 1890, while the foreign born in the cities increased about 4,000,000.

As a permanent panacea for our immigration ills, although distribution may do something, even a great deal, without restrictive measures it would seem doomed to failure under present conditions.

A decided aversion to becoming naturalized is evidenced by many of the recent racial groups coming to this country. In 1900 58 per cent of the foreign-born white males 21 years of age and over were fully naturalized, while only 18.7 were total aliens. Ten years later only 45.6 per cent had renounced all allegiance to foreign rulers, while 34 per cent had not even expressed the intention of so doing. In actual numbers the increase was from 914,917 to 2,266,636. Here is a situation which should demand immediate attention, as it goes to the very bottom of our political and social foundations.

In brief, a study of the period since the report of the Immigration Commission strongly supports its accuracy, fair-mindedness, and conclusions. The need for restriction is based on sound economic, political, and social considerations. The economic arguments may be summed up under two headings:

1. The economic characteristics of a large proportion of the present-day immigrant make him an undesirable competitor with American standards of living.
2. The changed conditions in the United States no longer demand the large exploitative population heretofore necessary.

From the social point of view it is believed that the growing increase of numbers and the rapid change from a northern and western to a predominating eastern and southern immigration, differing greatly in racial stock, language, education, and customs, altogether aside from any question of race superiority, is putting a too severe strain upon the assimilative resources of the Nation. It is best to make haste slowly, rather than aggravate the already heavy and burdensome social problems confronting the American public.

From a political standpoint the evidence is direct that the new immigration is direct and does not take rapidly to citizenship, and the mass of unnaturalized aliens is rapidly growing. Lately the political aspects of immigration have been brought to the fore, and the American people are ready to consider this aspect of the situation in a more reasonable way.

It is worth noting here the vast populations upon which our immigration has lately been drawing. Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Greece, Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, and Turkey alone have a combined population of more than 291,000,000. This vast

reservoir of peoples has so far hardly been tapped by the large immigration streams already flowing into this country and as Prof. Fetter says:

"The open-door policy is vain to relieve the condition of the masses of other lands. Emigration from overcrowded countries with the rarest exceptions leaves no permanent gap. Natural increase quickly fills the ranks of an impoverished peasantry. Nations under bad governments must find relief through the reform of their own political and economic conditions."

Within the last decade immigration has assumed a Pan American aspect, an international aspect, which should be taken into serious account. No longer can we nor should we look upon immigration to the United States from a narrow, national viewpoint. Canada has rapidly increased its immigration—400,000 in 1912—until it bids fair to rival the United States within a few years. South America is demanding labor to exploit its natural resources. These countries are economically in the position of the United States 50, 60, or even 75 years ago. They have a particular need for newcomers whereas the United States, entering upon a new industrial era, has not. Restriction, or rather regulation, on the part of this country will not deprive people in other lands of any opportunity to make new starts in new countries. The field is now continent wide. Such action on our part will only tend to broaden more rapidly the immigration field instead of having it concentrated so largely in this country. In many ways South America, through climate, through race, through language, through economic conditions, offers better opportunities for immigrants from southern and eastern Europe than the United States. Numbers of Italians have already gone to South America, especially to Argentina; the Portuguese language is spoken in Brazil and Spanish in the other countries. Regulation on our part will not deprive ambitious or crushed people of a new chance in life. The argument of an asylum from this standpoint loses considerable of its force. Distribution to the land is the panacea advanced by many for our immigration ills. Why not look also at the question of distribution from this international aspect. From a business standpoint such a policy will also have much good in it. The building up of these other countries will directly be a benefit to this Nation through trade increase, they being in the exploitative stage of industry, we in the manufacturing and export stage. The results can only be mutually advantageous to both groups.

But, many ask, can we expect any large increase in immigration after the war? Why is it necessary to take action? What are the effects of the war, and what will be the effects of the war upon our immigration problems?

First, the war has brought about a situation which gives a unique opportunity to judge of the value of the arguments advanced pro and con for the effects of possible restrictive action. Here is a situation in which immigration has been reduced to comparatively small dimensions, much more, in fact, than the most ardent restrictionist ever expected through the process of legislation. What, then, have been the effects upon this country? Has the nation during the last 16 months suffered from lack of labor? Has needed work been curtailed? Has industry suffered?

As simply and as briefly as possible, what have been the visible effects of the war upon the volume of incoming and outgoing migrations?

Year ending June 30:

1914 (immigrant and nonimmigrant).....	1,403,081
1915.....	434,244

Latter figure still larger than yearly average from 1890 to 1900.

This country can expect approximately 25,000 immigrant aliens a month, or 300,000 a year.

No large exodus.

1914:

Immigrant.....	303,338
Nonimmigrant.....	330,467

1915:

Immigrant.....	200,000
Nonimmigrant.....	180,000

First five months of present year, largely southern Italians:

Immigrant.....	89,000
Nonimmigrant.....	53,000

Total of 15,000,000 foreign-born in this country.

Italy, 2,000,000 immigrants.

In 1915 97,000 returned. Economic stress much stronger than the call of the bugle. In 1908 167,000 returned and in 1912 108,000. Only fair to say 70,000 have left from July to November.

On the whole we are slightly gaining through immigration. Need expect no diminution in the immigrant labor supply as the result of the call for cannon fodder.

Occupational make-up, 1915.

Professional—net increase.....	9,967
Skilled occupations—net increase.....	35,500
Miscellaneous group—net loss.....	11,308
All unskilled workers—net loss.....	79,500
Farm laborers gained.....	22,249

The first five months of the present year bore out the figures of last year.

Owing to the emphasis put upon the loss of American farmers to Canada during the last few years the fact should be brought out that the United States is and has been for some time adding to its labor supply from the Dominion. During the last 17 months 122,559 have entered from and only 30,775 have left for Canada. Mention Sir Thomas Shaunnessy's statement that once immigration rush again into eastern United States it will operate to push population out again to Canada. On the whole the population of the country has been slightly increased as a result of immigration since the outbreak of the war, but it is evident that the industrial forces which now depend upon the natural growth of the nation in population. Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, says in this regard, "It is inconceivable that in America of all countries any needed work should have to be neglected because of the lack of a foreign labor supply or because of a shortage of labor in general. It is hard to see how in a nation a majority of whose citizens are healthy and intelligent there can be any real shortage of labor in general. What there can be is a shortage of labor at a given price." The Labor Gazette for November-December says:

"A careful review of conditions can not, of course, warrant the conclusion that there is a general scarcity of labor in the United States in spite of the greatly increased industrial activity and the diminished immigrant supply."

More labor is being performed and more wages, and in many cases higher wages, are being paid, but these are merely indications of a condition where the slack of irregular employment is being taken up. If a real shortage in labor should come about and wages in consequence soar to too high levels, other tendencies will operate to check the situation—

1. Intensive use of machinery (Civil War illustration).
2. Industry and efficiency.
3. Conservation of labor supply.

Labor, like industry, at the moment is in prosperity. Wages are rising, unemployment is at the lowest ebb for years. Hours of labor have been shortened. A great deal of this is due to the present business prosperity, but it is fair to ask that if during the year a million or more immigrants had entered, would this situation be the same? The United States Commission on Industrial Relations states: "If immigration had continued at the average rate of the last 10 years, it would prove almost if not quite impossible to have brought industrial conditions to any proper basis in spite of the most extreme efforts of civic workers, trades-unions, and Government machinery. The great diminution of immigration as a result of the European war has already begun to show its salutary effects."

Royal Meeker, United States Commissioner of Labor Statistics, writing for the *Annalist*, January 3, says:

"Of course, the falling off in immigration has cut down the supply of labor, especially unskilled labor. Wages are rising steadily and will continue to rise, at least until the end of the European war. All the statistics bearing on the question of labor supply point unmistakably to the fact that there were more unskilled laborers in the United States before the war broke out than were required to carry on the industries of the country. This is evidenced by the fact that large numbers of workers have departed to the war zone and very few have come in, and yet there is no dearth of laborers in the country, except in a very few industries in certain localities. The present adjustment of labor supply to labor demand is much more equitable than that prevailing for many years preceding the outbreak of war.

"What will happen after hostilities cease no man can foretell. My guess is just as good as and no better than anyone else's. There must be a sharp advance of wages in Europe. Whether immigrants will rush to our shores or not depends on political action even more than on economic law. A wise policy of restriction of immigration is absolutely essential for the United States regardless of what action European countries may or may not take to prevent the emigration of their taxpayers and human targets for rifle and cannon practice."

Viewed from the broad aspect of the general welfare of the United States the present curtailment of immigration is a blessing in disguise. Will the present reduction in immigration be merely temporary or will it be permanent?

Those believing in a permanent diminution argue—

1. High wages and great demand for labor.

2. Love of country.

3. European restriction.

Arguments against takes rising cost of living, employment of women, difficulty of getting capital, several years for readjustment.

Love of country.—Russians in this country: 52 per cent Yiddish, 26 per cent Polish, only 2.5 per cent Russian. Austrian: 28 per cent Polish, rest Bohemians, Jews, Germans, and Hungarians. Immigrants from Austria are far more Slavic than German—over one-half Hungarians, or more than one-half made up of other racial groups. The Turks are really Greeks, Bulgars, Jews, and Armenians.

Effects of other wars.

Franco-Prussian:

1869, Turko-Greek.....	131,000
1870, French.....	118,000
1871, Balkan.....	82,554
1872, Anglo-Boer.....	141,000

Wars generally make for an immediate and temporary decrease followed by a return to normal or even an increase. Borne out by Frederick Hows, President Samuel Gompers says:

"They will come, if they can, to America, and come in such numbers as to overwhelm the workers already here, to depress their standard of life and to add to the already large number of unemployed."

If a policy of regulation is necessary, what means shall be taken? It is worth while noting here that the United States Immigration Commission, Industrial Relations Commission, and Mr. Royal Meeker, of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, are one on the necessity of restriction. Overwhelming immigration at the end of the war will only be productive of many evil results which should be guarded against. Believe fully in the ethical right and duty of this country to control population. * * *

The gentleman referred to that fact yesterday, and intimated that those from southern Europe naturalize as readily as those from the other sections of Europe, when the records show, as Prof. Jenks and the commission found, that about 70 per cent of the Irish, Scotch, and Germans and about 90 per cent of the Scandinavians become permanent citizens, and less than 35 per cent of those from countries where the most undesirable come ever become naturalized citizens, and taking the late reports, of the seventy-five or eighty thousand who have gone back "to the colors," as the gentleman said—although turning to the year before, when there were no "colors" to go back to—we find the same number returning year after year.

Prof. Jenks, in his recent book on "The Immigration Problem," states that more than 75 per cent of the Bohemian, Moravian, Danish, German, Irish, Norwegian, Scotch, Swedish, and Welsh races who had been in the United States 10 years or longer had been fully naturalized. Of the South Italians who have been here over 10 years only 34 per cent had been fully naturalized. Of the Slovaks only 25.3 per cent, and of the Magyars less than 27 per cent.

Thus it will be seen that nearly all of the older classes of immigrants desire to become American citizens, while but few of the recent immigrants seek this privilege.

Mr. RAKER. What is your theory of that, Mr. Chairman? You have gone into that?

Mr. BURNETT. Just as was said by Mr. Gompers, that they come over here in greater numbers when prosperity hangs over our country, but when they get a little money or hard times come they go back.

One gentleman referred to their being depositors in the postal savings bank. One of the bankers in Birmingham, Ala.—and there is a large number of them in that district—told me that they were making deposits in national banks for the purpose of later sending the money home, and because they were afraid of other banks in this country. That is the reason, gentlemen. They do not come here like the Scandinavian people who settled the great Northwest and made it blossom like the rose; they do not come here like the great German people; they do not come here like the other people from northwestern Europe, who come to become American citizens, but they come here for the purpose of earning what they can and carrying it back home.

Let me read you what the American consul at Messina, Sicily, while we were making our investigations there, and who had been there 13 years, said of the character of that immigration. He said:

After nearly 13 years' residence in Sicily, during which period I have tried to study the emigration question in all its phases, I have arrived at the conclusion that both Italy and America would benefit by its restriction. The fields of the former that now lie fallow, for lack of labor to cultivate them, would become productive, and the prisons and reformatories of the latter would not be overcrowded by a class of foreigners whose treacherous characteristics are such that a special arm of the detective service had to be created to keep them in check. It is said that the emigrant from upper Italy is sober, industrious, and makes a good citizen. I fear that the same can not be said of the one from Sicily or Calabria. The money he earns never sees the light of day after it finds its way to repose between the filthy linings of his leather wallet. His living expenses are about 40 cents a day, and the hogs in an American farmer's pen are more cleanly in their surroundings and habits than are he and his dozen associates who huddle together in one room and exist like animals, not human beings. When the wallet is well swollen, he puts the contents in a registered letter and sends it to his relatives here, who change it into Italian currency and deposit it in the post-office bank. * * *

Sometimes instead of sending it he brings it himself. In that case he appears upon the scene with a flashy suit, a top hat, a filled chain, and a brass watch, and struts among his former associates—a second Gulliver, a giant among pigmies. In a few weeks he returns, having induced some of his friends to accompany him. Immigrants of other nationalities, even the Polish Jews, spend their money where they make it, but the Sicilian and the Calabrese never. The only persons to whom their advent is a benefit are those who employ them at a cheaper figure than they would have to pay for American labor.

To at least check the constant rush of those people to our shores I see but one remedy, the insertion of the illiteracy clause in the immigration law. This would oblige about 85 per cent of the class to devote their attention to the developing of the industries of their own country, which sadly need the aid that we are only too glad to dispense with.

Gentlemen, that is the expression of a man who was consul at Messina for 13 years, living among those people.

Mr. SABATH (the acting chairman). He is making a statement with respect to the living conditions of these people here?

Mr. BURNETT. Their living conditions there. Gentlemen, I have only to refer you to Youngstown to convince you that the living conditions commenced over there are continued in this country. They are willing to accept the lowest standards of wages and to keep up the lowest standards of living, which are driving out the American workmen wherever they come in competition with him, in order by such parsimony and injury to our workers, whether native or naturalized, to save up a few hundred dollars with which to return permanently, as a rule, to their native lands. The fact that 10,000,000 aliens came during the last census decade and our foreign-born population increased only 3,000,000 is shown by the statistics.

If the birds of passage who came here and filled their pockets with our money and then returned to Europe were the ones who returned

again to America, it would not be so bad on the wage earner. This is apparent, because if they stayed a while they could gain some idea of American conditions and have some little sympathy with them. But those who come and stay a while and then return to Europe are not the ones who return. They nearly all stay in Europe and a new lot come over to drive out the American wage earner. In support of this statement I quote the following from a speech of Senator Overman, of North Carolina, on the floor of the Senate on April 19, 1912:

Table showing immigration, emigration, etc., for 11 years.

Year ending June 30—	Total alien arrivals. ¹	Total alien departures. ²	Immigrant alien arrivals in Note 1.	Per cent of immigrant aliens who have been in the United States before.	Nonimmigrant alien arrivals.
1901	562,863	209,318	487,918	11.9	74,950
1902	730,798	220,103	648,743	9.5	82,055
1903	921,315	247,569	857,046	8.9	64,269
1904	840,714	332,019	812,870	12.8	27,844
1905	1,069,755	385,111	1,026,499	12.1	33,256
1906	1,166,353	356,257	1,100,733	12.1	65,618
1907	1,438,469	431,306	1,285,849	6.8	153,120
1908	924,695	714,828	782,870	8.1	141,825
1909	944,235	400,392	751,786	(³)	192,449
1910	1,198,037	380,418	1,041,570	(³)	156,467
1911	1,030,300	518,215	878,567	(³)	151,733
Total since 1900, or for last 11 years	10,817,539	4,195,524	9,673,953	1,143,586

¹ Official Government statistics. (Annual report of Commissioner General of Immigration.)

² Statistics furnished to the Government by steamship companies. (Required by act of Feb. 20, 1907.)

³ Not given after 1900.

NOTE 1.—The distinction “immigrant alien” and “nonimmigrant alien” is fanciful. The only difference being as to whether the alien comes for the first time or comes intending to remain. A “nonimmigrant alien” is so classified if the alien says he expects to return to the native land.

NOTE 2.—Although 9,787,239 aliens entered this country during the last census decade (1900 to 1910) the Census Bureau reports that our foreign-born population increased only 3,129,766, which tends to show that the number of alien departures reported by the steamship companies falls short of the number that actually leave the country. The Immigration Commission reports that “at least 40 per cent of those coming return,” taking a minimum of \$250,000,000 annually out of the country.

As Prof. Jenks says in the above-quoted statement, the history of previous wars shows that there will be an increase instead of a diminution after peace is declared. Then, if that is so, what will be the character of that increase? Of course, everybody knows the present law will keep out cripples—those who are physically, mentally, and otherwise incapacitated, but not as effectively and effectually as the pending bill. There are thousands who will be moved by the spirit of patriotism to help rehabilitate their country and who will remain there.

Prof. Jenks then discusses a numerical limitation proposition that I do not agree with; that is, he says that he is really for a greater measure of restriction than I am. He is in favor of a numerical limitation; that is, if there are from four to five millions of any nationality here now, allow 5 or 10 per cent of that number to come from that country, and the same proportion in the other cases, based upon the

census of 1910, I believe. I do not believe that is a good plan. He advances one strong argument for it, namely, that it would be a permanent solution. He says that so far as the literacy test is concerned they can to some extent overcome it; but when men come here that are able to read their own language, certainly they are more capable of learning to read and understand our language and will take a greater interest in learning to read it.

Another reason why I can not consent to the percentage proposition is because I want the good people from other countries to come. Under that plan, it seems to me there would be a race among the steamship companies and among the steamship agents to get those who have the least encumbrances at home, and those who can get to our ports most readily. Hence it would defeat the very purpose of this legislation, which is intended to be selective and at the same time restrictive.

When I was in Hamburg as a member of the commission, I said to some German people there, "Why is it that more of your people do not come to America? You do well; you prosper, and we are glad to have you come." "Well," they said, "One reason is, that we are doing better here than we used to do. Another reason is that you are getting too many of these people from along the borders of the Mediterranean that our working people do not want to compete with in the labor market, and do not want their families to be thrown in contact with in the contaminating surroundings and environments that they bring with them."

Here is an article from Henry M. Hyde, of the Chicago Tribune, which, it seems to me, gentlemen, offers some particularly cogent reasons why there probably will be an increase after the war in Europe.

[Writing in the Chicago Tribune, Henry M. Hyde gives the following estimate of conditions in America after the European war, if legislation restricting immigration is not passed by the present Congress.]

Peace, prosperity, and high wages while the dam of war holds back the rising flood, then, when the war is over, a ruinous rush of illiterate, pauperized, and degraded peoples, coming from southern and eastern Europe and western Asia to clog the slums of Chicago and other cities.

That is what many students of immigration predict will be the effect of the great war on the United States.

They foresee the coming of millions of illiterate, unskilled, penniless laborers, who will undercut wages, lower the standard of living while increasing its cost, increase child labor, lengthen the hours of work, make peonage more possible, and postpone for years the success of the woman's movement in the United States.

They shudder at what will happen when the twentieth century is invaded by a vast army of people who have never risen above the standards of the sixteenth century.

They declare that now, while the war is acting as a temporary barrier to immigration, the people of the United States should take some steps which will prevent the inundation of democratic institutions by an abject and illiterate flood of feudal peasants and oriental serfs.

With the coming of peace they believe that not only will immigration from southern and eastern Europe be renewed on a much greater scale but that new and swelling streams will start from all of western Asia and as far east as Persia.

"We are already receiving immigrants from Asiatic Turkey, Circassia, Syria, and Arabia," wrote Prof. Edward A. Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, just before the war began. "An immigration has started up from Persia and conditions are ripe for a heavy influx from western Asia."

"There are in southern and eastern Europe and western Asia," says Dr. Warne in the last Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, "great reservoirs of races and peoples only recently tapped by the ocean steamship lines. No one can conceive for these racial groups any possible betterment in their economic condition growing

out of the present war. If anything, it will be worse, not better, and such as to increase their emigration."

Even among those experts who do not favor the further restriction of immigration, there is a widespread belief that the end of the war will see a tremendous influx of aliens.

Experts point out also that peace will release scores of great ocean liners which are now busy carrying soldiers and munitions of war. To the steamship companies the transportation of immigrants has been for years one of the most profitable features of their business. Their glowing circulars and glib-tongued agents have been responsible for much of the more or less undesirable immigration in the past. Free from war duty, they will certainly start at once to build up again their immigration business. No matter what the nations of Europe may do to keep their people at home, the steamship managers will do their utmost to fill the steerage of their ships with living freight.

Whatever the future may hold—and no man can be certain—is not this the time while things are at a standstill for the people of the United States to take stock of the immigration situation?

Is the United States to remain an open refuge for the poor and oppressed of every nation—with the exception of the Chinese? Or does the welfare of the people of the United States—and of democratic institutions—demand that further restrictions be placed on immigration?

I have also an article here, which I will insert in the record, by Mr. Waldemar Kaempffert, managing editor of the *Scientific American*. Here, in brief, is what he says:

We, too, must bear the burden. The tide of immigration which the United States may expect after the treaty of peace has been signed will carry with it much human wreckage that should be diverted before it reaches these shores. In times of peace we take the precaution of testing the intellectual fitness of Europeans at each port of entry. Our instruments and methods are rather crude, so crude that they reveal only the more conspicuously unfit. What we will soon need is some system of appraising the hordes that will descend upon us from Southern Europe—some means which will enable us to determine whether the terrors of war have not so far undermined a racial stock that it may not be permitted to contaminate the healthy human protoplasm out of which real Americans are made.

If that class of immigration is going to come in greatly increased numbers, as I believe it will, and as Mr. Gompers believes it will, then the bill will certainly work a very great benefit.

I want to read a little of the history of this legislation. Here is a statement which Mr. Gompers made in a letter which he sent to me last year:

For a moment I must again call attention to what is generally apprehended regarding immigration after the close of the present terrible European war. The nations engaged in the conflict will, undoubtedly, do everything within their power to keep the strong and healthy men at home. They will do everything in their power to encourage emigration of the weak or incapacitated men and those whose health is partially undermined. Many will be glad to escape compulsory military service, and will do all they can to get away from the burdens of taxation which will result from the war.

And, pray, where will all these men go? Surely they will not go from their own to other countries now engaged in the struggle. They will come, if they can, to America, and come in such numbers as to overwhelm the toilers already here, to depress their standard of life, and to add to the already large number of unemployed.

The present is the time to make provision against what will surely become a menace unless the laws of our country shall restrict and limit and better regulate immigration.

If ever the citizenship of the United States have given indorsement to any measure of legislation, it has certainly done so for the principles embodied in the immigration bill now before Congress.

Nor necessarily for your information, but because of the benefit the record may have let me state that:

In 1896-97 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. It was vetoed by President Cleveland. The House passed the bill over the President's veto. In the Senate it failed of passage over the veto by a few votes.

There is one place where I think the statement of Mr. Gompers is at fault. My recollection is that the Senate failed to consider it because it came to them on the 4th of March, as the administration was going out and too late to be taken up by the Senate.

In 1898 the Senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test, but the bill, it is generally conceded, was crowded out of consideration of the House of Representatives by reason of the Spanish-American War.

In 1902 the House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test.

That bill, as I recollect it, was an amendment that was offered by Mr. Underwood as a rider on an appropriation bill. No point of order was made against it, and it was passed in the House and was never considered in the Senate.

In 1906 the Senate passed an immigration bill in which the literacy test was embodied. The House substituted a bill creating the Federal Immigration Commission. The commission consisted of nine members, eight of whom recommended the adoption of the literacy test as the most practical means for restricting, limiting, and better regulating immigration.

After the Immigration Commission had made its investigations and recommendations Senator Dillingham introduced a substitute bill which is substantially the same as the one we have now before us.

And now, gentlemen, I want to refer you to the history of this for the purpose of appealing to this committee not to allow any delays that will jeopardize this bill—not to allow any continuation of these constant debates. You understand this measure; every member of the committee, I believe, understands it. There is only one point of contention in the whole matter, and that is the literacy test.

Judge Saunders yesterday criticized the increase of the head tax. I called his attention to the fact that this bill provides that children under 16 years of age accompanied by either father or mother shall not pay any head tax at all. Under the present law those under 16 years old unaccompanied by their parents or guardians can not come in unless in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor they are permitted to do so. The object of that was to end the importation of children of tender years for padrone and immoral purposes, and its need was shown by official investigation. He attacked the proposition of "psychopathic inferiority." That phrase was put in, as I stated, under a recommendation of New York alienists and State boards that have the care of the insane. An eminent physician and alienist discussed it, and the definition of it was given by Congressman Brown, of New York, who urged its adoption in the House. This committee did not put it in. It was adopted by the House by a very large majority after a full discussion of its meaning and its effect. Mr. Brown's idea, as that of the alienists, was that it would tend to diminish the number of insane that are constantly coming in and are such great expense to the taxpayers.

In that connection I have here an extract from a New York newspaper of recent date. It says:

NEW YORK'S INSANE ARE INCREASING—LARGELY DUE TO ALIENS, SAYS STATE HOSPITAL COMMISSION.

ALBANY, *January 29.*

The annual report of the State Hospital Commission, submitted to the legislature to-day, shows that 6,289 new cases of insanity developed in the year and required commitment to the State hospitals; 1,677 cases relapsed and also required commitment and there remained in State care in the 14 civil hospitals at the close of the year

33,357 insane patients; 1,703 persons were discharged recovered and 1,727 as improved. The ratio of recoveries based on the admission of new cases was 1 to 5. The net increase in the State hospitals for the year was 812.

The commission reports an increase in the number of the registered insane of 123 per cent in 24 years, while the general population of the State increased only 65 per cent. The disproportionate increase in the number of registered insane is explained in part by the increased confidence in institutions, with the consequent increase in commitments, and by an increase in the number of defective aliens. Twenty-seven per cent of the registered insane are neither citizens of New York nor of the United States.

The necessity of stiffening the immigration laws to relieve the State from the constantly increasing burden of supporting alien defectives is pointed out. Of the huge number of immigrants annually arriving at steamship ports of this country from 28 to 30 per cent are destined to New York.

Here is another clipping taken from the New York Herald:

NEW YORK'S ALIEN INSANE.

It now costs, according to the annual report of the New York State Hospital Commission just issued, about \$6,750,000 a year for the maintenance of the State's insane, and last year very nearly half a million was expended in new buildings for them. This is a great growing burden. The number of the insane has increased 123 per cent in the last 24 years, while our population has increased only 65 per cent. We now have to care for nearly 35,000 insane.

More than one-fourth (27 per cent) of New York State's registered insane are citizens neither of the State nor of the United States. Here is what portends ill for the State's burdens in this matter unless reform is brought about.

Just at the moment the question is not acute. War has stopped immigration to a great extent, though it has also put an end to the deportation of insane aliens. Manifestly, what is needed for the time just after the war, when immigration will undoubtedly be stimulated, is strict medical inspection, so as to prevent to as great a degree as possible any further burdening of New York with this very undesirable material, costing literally millions of dollars a year to no purpose.

In 1906, the test having passed the Senate, we almost passed the literacy test in the House, but gentlemen made the specious argument that has been made here every time this matter has been presented to the committee, that the members of Congress did not understand it; that there ought to be a searching investigation; and so some who were friendly to the literacy test were captivated by that specious argument and a substitute for the test was put in the bill providing for an Immigration Commission to fully investigate the whole matter, at home and abroad.

At that time I was the ranking member of this committee and had reason to believe that I would be a member of that commission if created; and yet, I opposed it with all the force that was in me because I knew it was put in there for the purpose of delay. And that is what resulted. After an investigation lasting nearly four years, as Prof. Jenks has said, there were several members, he among them, who at first doubted whether there ought to be any restriction of any kind except for purely mental, moral, and physical defects, every member of that commission but one was convinced of the fact, that the literacy test was the most feasible and practicable way of reaching what every member of the commission, including Mr. Bennet himself said ought to be done, namely "substantially restrict immigration."

After those four years of investigation we gentlemen still said, "Oh, give us more time to digest those 41 voluminous volumes of the report." That was hinted at yesterday, that we had not digested those 41 volumes, and that is true. No Congressman could possibly have

read and digested all the testimony, facts, expert studies, and everything, but in a little brief summary the commission, as a whole, said this:

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, and therefore demand legislation which will at the present time restrict the further admission of such unskilled labor.

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

(a) A sufficient number be debarred to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

(b) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough, by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living, to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

(c) As far as possible the aliens excluded should also be those who, by reason of their personal qualities or habits, would least readily be assimilated or would make the least desirable citizens.

The following methods of restricting immigration have been suggested:

(a) The exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language.

(b) The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.

(c) The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.

(d) The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.

(e) The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.

(f) The material increase of the land tax.

(g) The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of the men with families.

All these methods would be effective in one way or another in securing restrictions in a greater or less degree. A majority (8 of the 9) of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations, furnishes in its report reasons for such restriction, and points out methods by which Congress can attain the desired result if its judgment coincides with that of the commission.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you believe that the provisions of this bill will open the doors of this country to the persecuted for religion's sake of all the world?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir. I am going to discuss that a little later, and I am going to ask for a little more time. I am going to discuss the effect it will have upon the Jewish people, and I think I can prove from the record that gentlemen are mistaken in their estimate as to the large number of Jewish people that will be excluded.

I now return to Mr. Gomper's letter:

In 1913 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the test recommended by the commission. The bill was vetoed by President Taft. That bill passed the Senate over the President's veto 72 to 18 but failed to pass the House over the President's veto by a few votes.

Some of the gentlemen on yesterday told us that we do not know anything about the question; that you, as a Representative of your district in Louisiana, or in North Carolina, or in California, did not understand it; that Senator Nelson of Minnesota, that great man, himself an immigrant, did not know the views of his people in the great West when he voted for the passage of this bill; that Mr. Volstead, himself, perhaps the son of an immigrant did not understand it when he voted for it; that Mr. Helgesen, an honored former member of this committee from South Dakota, did not know what his people

in the great Northwest wanted when this proposition was being considered by him and us here at this table and in Congress. Gentlemen tell us that the Americans in the Northwest and the Scandinavians would not now do the work on the railroads and in the mines and in the great industries.

Gentlemen, that is not true. They have done it. They did that work all through the Northwest until they were driven out by the low-priced foreign labor. Gentlemen sit in their offices and write briefs and make profound legal arguments before the courts of the country upon great questions of law, and come down here and tell us we do not know what the people in Minnesota, in Wisconsin, in New York, in Alabama, or in the other great States of the Union want.

Before I go further I want to call attention to this fact. In the New York delegation itself in the House on the last vote there were 7 in favor of this bill and 30 against it, and I understand the votes in favor of it from New York will be twice 7 this time.

In the State of Pennsylvania there were 23 for it and 13 against it. In Ohio there were 12 for it and 6 against it. In Illinois there were 13 for and 12 against it. All of these are States in which there is a great accumulation of this immigration influence [reading from President Gompers's letter]:

In 1914-15 the House and Senate passed by more than two-thirds vote the immigration bill now before Congress, which contains the literacy test. That is the bill which President Wilson has vetoed.

In the President's message he asks the following question: "Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter?" The answer is found in the Democratic and the Republican national platform declarations as far back as 1896. The Democratic National Convention platform made the following declaration:

"We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market."

In that same year—that is, 1896—the Republican National Convention platform contained the following declaration:

"For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and the wages of our workmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor, we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write."

He said further:

Trusts furnish money to the National Liberal Immigration League to finance a campaign against immigration legislation—

There is where the propaganda starts——

Mr. MEEKER. From whom are you reading now?

Mr. BURNETT. From the letter of Mr. Gompers.

Mr. MEEKER. Does the chairman mean to say that there is money being used to influence Members against this measure?

Mr. BURNETT. Not to influence Members of Congress, but to promote the propaganda. I will read to you his evidence.

Mr. MEEKER. I am asking the chairman; I am not asking Mr. Gompers.

Mr. BURNETT. I am simply stating facts that Mr. Gompers gives. He gives letters from Mr. Behar, the managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, in which he does ask for money for the steamships and trusts for the purpose of bringing about the defeat of this very bill.

Mr. MEEKER. I want to get it clear now. Are the representatives of the men who are opposing this here now?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know whether they are or not. I am not making any charges against these gentlemen. You see floods of literature all over the country sent out by this league. Let me read you some extracts—

Mr. SABATH. You have not seen any literature from that source this year, have you, Judge?

Mr. BURNETT. No, sir. And I want to say another thing that is important. This gentleman, Mr. Behar, has favored us with his presence here every time there was a hearing on this matter until this year; but this time, for some reason or other—

Mr. RAKER. Is he the one that Mr. Gompers refers to?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, sir.

A VOICE. Mr. Behar is ill; his son is here.

Mr. BEHAR. I am ready to answer any questions—

Mr. BURNETT. I am not asking any questions; I am offering the testimony that Mr. Gompers has furnished, that the National Liberal Immigration League sought financial aid from steamship companies, from the Steel Trust, and other similar concerns. Here is one of them:

The following is a banking statement of Nissim Behar in account with the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York on the company's financial blank:

Nissim Behar, 150 Nassau Street, New York. In account with Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

If no report be made within 10 days the account will be considered correct. Vouchers returned.

Line No.	Day.	Checks.	Day.	Total checks.	Date.	Deposits.
1.....	10	\$1,083.13	10	\$1,083.13	9	\$11,083.13
2.....	17	200.00	17			
3.....	28	9,800.00	26	9,800.00		
Balance interest to Dec. 28.....						8.13
Total Dec. 31, 1910.....				11,083.13		11,091.26
Balance.....						8.13

Then he gives a letter from him [reading]:

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE,
November 23, 1910.

MESSRS. JAPHOT & SAGET,
Compagnie Generale Transatlantique,
Rue Auber, Paris, France.

GENTLEMEN: We arrived safely on the 22d instant. I was permitted to leave the steamer without any formality as an American citizen, but my baggage, naturally, went with the rest to Ellis Island, causing me some annoyance and loss of time. On the 24th I went to Washington to see the Secretary and hand him over a letter from the secretary of our league, of which I inclose copy. I inclose also clipping from the Sun on this subject. The same has been appearing throughout the press generally, even in the Call, which is the Socialist paper.

Though I am personally not unknown to the Secretary, still I took with me my friend, Mr. William S. Bennet, who is prominent in the Republican Party. The Secretary assured us that he and the President are anxious to prevent the breaking of family ties of American residents, but the law must be obeyed, according to the decision given by the solicitor, as per inclosed. But he will do his best to make the application as rare and as lenient as possible.

As to the consequences of the last elections, I was told at Washington that they would be felt in the tariff question, the Democrats being since long declared against

the tariff, if not unanimously, at any rate in an overwhelming majority. As to the immigration question, there are Democratic restrictionists, as well as liberals, and, to be more correct, they go according to the manifestation of public opinion.

I will urge all my friends to start a tremendous agitation throughout the country, beginning in December and continuing through January. I shall be very glad to receive your contribution as soon as possible, as I am compelled to make inroads now before the end of November in the supplies which are to last until August, 1911.

Respectfully, yours,

And here is a cablegram:

POSTAL TELEGRAPH COMMERCIAL CABLE TELEGRAM.

DECEMBER 15, 1911.

Director STORM,

Hamburg-Amerika Linie, Hamburg, Germany:

We owe over \$7,000 in salaries, rent, printing, etc. Unless we pay immediately we will be sued and put in bankruptcy with disagreeable consequences for all concerned.

BEHAR.

And the following letter confirms the cablegram:

Mr. ADOLPH STORM,

*Director Hamburg-Amerika Linie,
Hamburg, Germany.*

DEAR SIR: This morning I said to Mr. Boas that I am continually assailed by creditors to whom we are indebted for rent, printing, etc. I added that it had been suggested to me to send these people to him, but he had always acted so kindly and gentlemanlike that I found it my duty to spare him any trouble. He suggested to me to address to you the following cablegram, "We owe over \$7,000 in salaries, rent, printing, etc. Unless we pay immediately we will be sued and put in bankruptcy, with disagreeable consequences for all concerned," which I did.

Very truly, yours,

Then he gives another [reading]:

Mr. EMIL L. BOAS,

*Resident Director Hamburg-American Line,
35 Broadway, New York.*

DEAR SIR: The league has so far succeeded in checking the efforts of restrictionists. * * *

The formulation of such a campaign is obviously impossible when we have no idea to what amount we may commit ourselves. We therefore suggest that a regular subvention would greatly enhance the value of our activity.

Mr. RAKER. That is what you might call newspaper reporting, is it not?

Mr. BURNETT. I read that as a letter emanating from the managing director of this organization.

Mr. SABATH. You know my views, Judge, as to that kind of work, and you know my views as to some of these gentlemen. But at the same time, in justice to yourself, I think it would be fair if you would read the other part of the letter.

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, it is too long. The gentlemen can read it; it is all in the Congressional Record, and it can all go into the record here.

(The letter referred to is in full as follows:)

JANUARY 24, 1908.

Mr. EMIL L. BOAS,

*Resident Director Hamburg-American Line,
35 Broadway, New York.*

DEAR SIR: The league has so far succeeded in checking the efforts of restrictionists, but the foes of immigration are the kind of people whose energy is increased by opposition, and whose earnestness and enthusiasm grow by defeat. The Junior Order

tents have multiplied in Pennsylvania and in other parts of the country, and the delegates of the Immigration Restriction League and of other restrictive organizations are agitating everywhere.

We have sent to Washington a number of delegations composed of members of various nationalities, but the delegates were not really chosen by bodies of their own nationality. If we are to continue the campaign successfully we must penetrate into the masses and interest them to send delegations and instruct Congress that they are opposed to further restriction of immigration.

Our agitation should be carried on in the following ways:

First. Through mass meetings organized in all important centers voting resolutions.

Second. Through delegations to Congress and to all important conventions.

Third. Through public lectures and through special delegates visiting men's and women's clubs throughout the country.

Fourth. Through delegates visiting the societies of various nationalities, as Italians, Hebrews, Hungarians, etc., including the unions, for the purpose of advocating liberal immigration.

Fifth. Through literature. The league ought to continue to send pamphlets and other publications to the Members of Congress and other notable citizens, and to the public in general.

Sixth. Through correspondence. We have to send appeals and communications to some 15,000 influential persons, most of them clergymen.

In order to prove effective the propaganda must be carried on steadily all the year round. It would require vast financial resources to cover adequately all the above-enumerated points. However, if we had a definite sum of money to spend annually, we could arrange a plan for a systematic campaign, selecting the most important means of agitation. The formulation of such a plan is obviously impossible when we have no idea to what amount we may commit ourselves. We therefore suggest that a regular subvention would greatly enhance the value of our activity.

Hoping you will take this matter into consideration for the present year, I remain.

Sincerely, yours,

(N. BEHAR),
Managing Director.

Mr. BURNETT. In regard to the effect that this bill will have upon the Jewish people especially, I think gentlemen altogether misapprehend that and overestimate it.

First, briefly, in regard to the proposition that Mr. Marshall has suggested and what seems to me an impossible amendment in reference to those who flee from religious or political persecution. If that amendment were made, it would open up to the Mexicans every little political revolution they have down there from which their people are fleeing. It would open wide our gates.

Mr. JOHNSON. In the case of the present troubles in Mexico, unless the people are being persecuted in a religious way the gates of the United States would not be open to them under this bill?

Mr. BURNETT. That is true.

Now, gentlemen, with reference to the word "solely," that is for the purpose of having it definite and certain for that reason and that reason only. The Commissioner General, who is present, says that that is the construction he would place upon it. It seems to me it is the only reasonable and certain construction that could be put upon it—not what they were coming here for, but what they were leaving the country of their last permanent residence for.

Mr. SABATH. If that is the view of the commissioner and the view of the gentlemen who are members of this committee, why can we not frame that proviso so there can not be any question about it?

Mr. BURNETT. There can not be any question anyway. And in our zeal in making amendments, my fear is that it may be so liberalized that it would furnish an excuse for getting them in for other reasons than religious persecution.

Mr. JOHNSON. We can take that up in committee in our own time.
Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Now, in regard to the number of the Jewish people effected. This bill is not aimed, gentlemen, at those people. There are very few of them in my district, but those few are men and women of high character. They are people of broad views. They are liberal, they are good citizens, and every one of them that I know has become a naturalized American citizen.

Gentlemen are mistaken in regard to the percentage of illiterates among the Jews. Take the last report of the Commissioner General of Immigration. There were 26,496 Hebrews admitted; 13,700 women and 12,700 men. Under 14 years of age there were 6,794. It would not touch one of them, because children under 16 are not subjected to the literacy test by the bill; they are exempt.

Let us see about the others. From 14 to 44 years there were 17,607 men and 2,096 women. That makes an aggregate then of 19,703, and of that number there were only 765 males who could not read and write and 2,223 females. You can make the calculation as to the percentage, remembering the various exceptions in young wives, aged parents, and others.

Mr. SIEGEL. Is it not a fact that the immigration which came at that time came from England and the other European countries instead of from Russia?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not think so. If it had come from England and they had been in England a great while, certainly they could all read and write.

Mr. SIEGEL. Is it not a fact, though, that it is the war period that you are referring to?

Mr. BURNETT. That is true.

Mr. SIEGEL. And therefore very few of the people would come here from Russian Poland.

Mr. BURNETT. But they did come. The seas were open to Russia, and the fact is a great many of them did come, and the statistics of the Commissioner General will show a large number.

Mr. SIEGEL. One other question. My impression was that the immigration from Russia dropped from three hundred and some odd thousand a year—

Mr. BURNETT. One hundred and thirty-eight thousand. There were then 108,000 that were over 14 years of age, 7,613 males and 13,591 females that could not read, which still was not a high percentage.

I want to call your attention to still another provision which would let a number of those people in. If they are grandfathers, if they are fathers over 55 years of age, coming to or with admissible grandchildren or children, they are not subjected to the literacy tests. Those between 14 and 16 would not be subjected to it, and that again would reduce the number. So far as the women are concerned, my observation is that as to most of the Jewish people the women come as wives or mothers or daughters, and therefore altogether with the exceptions in their favor the bill would not, in my judgment, exclude 5 per cent of the males and not over 5 or 6 per cent of the females, perhaps even a less per cent of the females than of the males. Hence, I believe that the deduction you gentlemen have sought to draw is an erroneous one in regard to the Jews that would be excluded.

On that other proposition, that they are fleeing solely from religious persecution, it ought not to be partly religious persecution and partly political. This ought to be a haven for those that are oppressed for conscience' sake, and I have never been one of those willing to close the doors against them. But if we proceed to enlarge that door and admit people who are pretending—perhaps not so many of the Hebrews as of other nationalities—that they come here because they are oppressed for conscience' sake, then you see it becomes almost entirely abortive so far as illiterate aliens are concerned.

Mr. MEEKER. Just at that point, is there not some way in which that could be safeguarded? Of course, I presume this will come up in committee. As I understand it, this whole discussion of this bill is aimed at Sicily and the southern part of Europe there?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; and Turkey and portions of Syria, and portions of Asia Minor and Mexico.

Mr. MEEKER. We have heard nothing of the Mexican in all these discussions.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; the Mexicans are hit harder than anybody.

Mr. MEEKER. But those who obtain employment in the steel mills are mostly those from lower Italy.

Mr. BURNETT. You heard here awhile ago the railroads from out in Kansas and those sections of the country objecting to this very bill because, they said, they were getting thousands of them, and 98 per cent they said were illiterate Mexicans. Here is their letter:

[The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. Law Department, Office of Solicitor for Kansas.]

TOPEKA, KANS., *January 3, 1913.*

DEAR SIR: There is a bill pending before Congress known as the Dillingham-Burnett bill, which restricts immigration through the imposition of an educational test.

I have not read the provisions of the bill, but am informed that its passage will prevent the immigration of Mexican laborers, now relied on almost entirely by the railway companies in Kansas and the Southwest.

Without this Mexican labor it will be impossible for the railway companies to secure men enough to keep their tracks in proper condition for effective service.

Ninety-nine per cent of these Mexican laborers can not read or write, but after they have been in this country for a few years they adapt themselves to our ways, and those with families send their children to school.

All the railways in the territory mentioned would be greatly crippled should this Mexican labor be excluded.

I shall thank you to give attention to this feature of the Dillingham-Burnett bill, and anything you can do in the matter will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

WM. R. SMITH.

Mr. MEEKER. If that is the thing you are trying to get at, it seems to me that it could be drawn in some other way, so that the fellow who was going to be stopped would know what they were driving at. It seems to me that if this is aimed at a certain section and certain groups of individuals it could be drawn in some way so that it would specify them.

Now, I want to ask this question further. Do you feel that the Sicilian or the man from southern Italy who can read and who could pass that literacy test is less a menace in the very problem you are discussing than the fellow who can not read? Two laborers come here; one can pass this test and the other can not, and they go and work side by side. Is the illiterate man more of a menace than the other?

Mr. BURNETT. I think so; because of the fact that he is more subservient to the influence of the man above him. I think the man who has some literary qualifications will have ambitions superior to the other. Gentlemen have made the argument against the illiteracy test that it did not keep out the blackhand; and it does not. This bill, however, in other sections, tightens up the law against the criminal to a very great extent. But the illiteracy test keeps out that man who is a pliant tool in the hands of the blackhand. It keeps out, on the East Side of New York, where the blackhand makes his rendezvous, those people who are afraid to turn him over to the minions of the law. It keeps out that crowd that are following the banners of the I. W. W.—those people who in that strike in Lawrence had emblazoned on their standards, "No God; no law; no master."

Mr. SIEGEL. Following your reasoning for a moment, the statistics for the year ending 1915 of all the inmates of the prisons of the State of New York show that out of 5,284 at the time of conviction, only 219 were illiterate, and that amongst the men received during that period of time there were 59 college graduates, 121 graduates of high schools, 2,017 graduates of common schools, 2,249 who could read and write, 24 who could read only, and 595 who had not an English education. Now, do you think that a literacy test would keep those men from committing crime?

Mr. BURNETT. Possibly not. And yet I wish to insert in the record here a statement from the prosecuting attorney in the State of New Jersey, in which he says that a large per cent of those who were convicted of crime were illiterate. The letter is from the prosecuting attorney of Somerset, N. J., and addressed to President Taft, under date of February 8, 1913:

My duties as prosecuting attorney of Somerset County, N. J., have given me an excellent opportunity to check up in one important particular the investigations and conclusions of the Immigration Commission with reference to the illiteracy test. During the last two years I have kept a careful record of the last 114 criminal cases that I have prosecuted against aliens, with the following interesting results:

	Illiterate.	Literate.
Homicide.....	3	6
Atrocious assault and battery.....	34	2
Simple assault and battery.....	9	2
Larceny.....	14	1
Sexual crime.....	7	1
Perjury.....	2	5
Excise.....	11	1
Marriage.....	3	4
Frauds.....	2	1
Miscellaneous.....	6	1
Total.....	91	23

The following conclusions are deducible from the above:

(1) Of the 114 crimes committed by aliens 54 were acts of personal violence; and of these 54, 46 were committed by illiterates, while only 8 were chargeable to those able to read and write.

(2) Of the 46 committed by illiterates, 3 were homicides, 34 were atrocious assaults (by maiming and wounding with a deadly weapon), and only 9 were simple assaults, showing conclusively that the illiterate alien 37 times out of 46 makes use of a deadly weapon in order to avenge his wrongs, fancied or real.

(3) Out of 16 cases of larceny (stealing of all kinds), 14 defendants were illiterate.

(4) Out of 8 sexual crimes, 7 were committed by illiterates, 3 of these being carnal abuse of infants under 10 years of age.

(5) Out of 3 perjury cases, 2 were against illiterates; that is, of those brought to justice.

(6) Out of 16 cases for violation of excise laws, 11 were illiterates, showing an utter disregard for laws.

(7) Of the 4 crimes against the institution of marriage, 3 were illiterates.

(8) Only in cases of fraud did the literate exceed the illiterate.

I am, Mr. President, sincerely, yours,

FREDERICK A. POPE,

Prosecutor of Pleas, Somerset County, N. J.

Mr. SIEGEL. Judge, you are referring to the time previous to 1913, for the two years—

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Pope's statement.

Mr. SIEGEL. You know, Judge, of course, that there are no statistics in the State of New Jersey on the question; that there are none required by statute to be kept, and none were kept officially, and none of the records down there show any such statistics, and that during the year 1915 the three men indicted and convicted for murder in the first degree were American and native born. I have personally made an investigation of the situation down there, spending several days, and I shall at the proper time insert a letter tending to show that if conditions were as gloomy as you indicate in 1911 and 1912 there has been a vast improvement in that community, although there has been a big increase of foreign population.

Mr. BURNETT. Gentlemen, I shall try to take the statements made by sworn officials as being correct. All I know is the statement I have spoken of. The official says he kept statistics.

Mr. SABATH. At the time I doubted very much the accuracy of that statement, Mr. Chairman, as you know, and I endeavored to secure information. And I am really thankful to the gentlemen from New York that he has secured the information that will bear out my statement that the statement of Mr. Pope was not accurate and was not based on any actual cases that were tried in that county.

Mr. BURNETT. I am not relying on either of the gentlemen. The Immigration Commission, on page 25 of statement of conclusions and recommendations, says: "The proportion of the more serious crimes of homicide, blackmail, and robbery, as well as the least serious offenses, is greater among the foreign born. The disproportion in this regard is due principally to the prevalence of homicides among Italians and to the violation of city ordinances.

Now, gentlemen, on the other statement, let me call your attention to this: Here is the last report of the Commissioner General, and on pages 70 and 71 you will find that from the Russian Empire 14,496 Hebrews came in 1915. So you see that, contrary to the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York, the large majority of them were from Russia.

Mr. SABATH. What year is that?

Mr. BURNETT. Last year; 1915.

Mr. SIEGEL. As a matter of fact, what I wanted to bring out at that time was the fact that during this past year immigration from Russia certainly was not up to the mark as far as the Jewish people are concerned.

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly not. Immigration is not up to the mark from any country in 1915.

Mr. SIEGEL. I did not mean to say that the 25,000 were not from Russia.

Mr. BURNETT. I understood the gentleman to ask if they were not from England.

Mr. SIEGEL. Some of them were from England, certainly.

Mr. HOOD. Speaking of the better element that you are now talking about, this says: "Even at present, should the law go into effect to-morrow, it does not take long to learn to read and write."

Mr. BURNETT. That is true; and the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner General, who more effectively and efficiently enforced the law in regard to keeping out undesirables than any administration we have ever had, says that he has sent back more than twice as many as any other administration under the law as it now stands. He informed me the other day—and I suppose he would not object to being quoted—that Italy already is trying and has been trying for some time to conform to the various details of this law.

Now, gentlemen, if that is true the very agitation itself has done some good. And, as suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hood, if the fear of it has brought about that improvement, certainly the enactment of the law would be beneficial. Prof. Jenks says he wants the improvement made permanent. It would enable these people to become better citizens and enable them to take care of themselves in the labor markets of the world, and I am the last one to raise any outcry against them.

Possibly I did not reply fully to the suggestion of my friend Mr. Meeker. If this law does not meet that proposition, if "solely" does not mean that, I would be perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to adopt some amendment that would meet it, provided it did not go further.

Mr. SCHALL. Could we not put in a definition of that there?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Schall's suggestion is a good one. Where there is any question as to the meaning of terms, the debate on the floor of the House is always taken as shedding light on a doubtful question, and I am willing to state upon the floor of the House when this comes up, as I have stated before, that the only purpose of that provision is to allow people to come in who are actually fleeing from and because of religious persecution; and I want it to be so construed to admit those who are really fleeing from religious persecution.

Mr. MEEKER. Along that line, Mr. Chairman, when the committee meets to consider that, I wonder if there could not be suggested, not a paragraph, but the necessary wording to clearly define that in the bill.

Mr. BURNETT. Possibly so, and I am perfectly willing to consider it.

Mr. SIEGEL. In other words, your idea is to have the language practically the same, but it shall not be construed to interfere with any person who flees from religious persecution. Suppose he states that, although he comes here for the purpose of running a lottery?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not think we ought to take such a statement and let him in.

Gentlemen, the whole country is aroused on this subject, and especially are the men who toil alarmed at the dreary outlook for them unless this bill is passed. In conclusion, I want to quote from a speech made on this bill last year by one of the able, fearless repre-

sentatives of labor on the floor of the House, Congressman Buchanan, of Illinois:

[Speech of Hon. Frank Buchanan, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, January 7, 1915.]

IMMIGRATION.

The House had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when I see gentlemen here who I know are educated, experienced, and sincere, spending their time and efforts making speeches for the poor foreign working people, I sometimes wonder how it is possible for them to stand by and have nothing to say in behalf of the poor, downtrodden, foreign-born working people of this country, who, after having come here, are now being exploited and robbed by the greedy system. A part of that same foreign element of which they speak is to-day on strike in Colorado, Ohio, Michigan, and other places, trying to protect themselves from those vicious corporations and financial pirates who, through their far-reaching methods of fraud and deception, have induced these people to come here, and are now forcing upon them a yoke of industrial slavery such as never before has been experienced in this American country.

Why is it that men plead with such apparent sincerity of purpose for the poor, ignorant people of the foreign countries, yet fail to raise their voices to secure protection for them in this country from the industrial combinations that are exploiting them and forcing them to work under conditions that are almost unbearable?



